

**From:** John Hightower  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 12/6/01 5:33pm  
**Subject:** microsoft settlement should be upheld as is

The proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case should be upheld. In fact, since the case never was about consumers, but about bailing out Microsoft's competitors at the expense of consumers, the settlement is far too restrictive on Microsoft. But this is a case of the lesser of many evils, so it should be upheld in order to end this fiasco and allow the Justice Department to put taxpayers' time and money to better use.

As far as offering a subset of Windows without browser, instant messaging and media player, other Operating Systems have built-in web browsers and Windows should also. Browsers were free before Netscape started charging as much as complete Operating Systems for their buggy, crash-prone product, and Microsoft did us end-users a favor by offering a better product as part of the Operating System, like other OS's have done.

Media Player has been a part of Windows since Windows 3.1, and Microsoft should be allowed to make their products better and more of what the end-users want without being bludgeoned by competitors who can't compete successfully in the marketplace without government interference.

The same principle should apply to Instant Messaging, especially since AOL, ICQ and Netscape Messenger are nothing but advertising delivery systems. MSN Messenger works far better, more reliably, and is a logical inclusion for Windows. All are free, so if AOL wants to extend it's monopoly by excluding competition, it should not be allowed to do so. MSN Messenger is pro-consumer, and should be allowed to stand as is. If Microsoft's competition wants to flourish, then let them put in the billions of dollars and years of Research and Development that Microsoft has. Let them listen to their end-users as much as Microsoft does, instead of putting their time and money into political donations and subsequent government interventions on their behalf.

Microsoft took a multi-standard competing OS industry and made it possible for us end-users to benefit from standards that let Windows programs work together instead of crashing constantly, and lowered the price of applications in the process. I still remember when Word Processors alone cost \$300. Now they cost less than \$100, and have more features as well. And are reliable across Windows.

Windows comes from Microsoft's Research and Development, and should be theirs to do with as they want. It's their Intellectual Property, and

their competitors shouldn't be allowed to steal the results of their time, effort and billions of dollars. Their competitors didn't put in the time and money, and they shouldn't benefit from a company which did.

And as far as Java, why should Microsoft be forced to put Sun's Java, or anyone's Java, in their Operating System? Who cares whether Java is in an Operating System or not? Not this end-user, not this consumer. If I want that buggy, crash-prone thing, I can download it. Again, this is NOT a consumer benefit, it's simply saving competitor's crummy products, trying to force their stuff on consumers who've showed over and over that they don't want them.

As for business discounts for Microsoft customers, other businesses do that, so Microsoft should be able to also. Nobody should be forced to buy Netscape, AOL, Sun, Oracle, or other Microsoft-competitor's products if they don't want them on their computer. Sometimes taking all this crap off computers' hard drives breaks other programs, and cripples the Operating System itself. QuickTime and RealPlayer have both done this when I've uninstalled them in the past, for instance.

The States' remedies only try to make competitors the beneficiaries of Microsoft's Research and Development, plus Marketing, efforts, so their proposed "remedies" should not be given credence. Those are definitely anti-end-user, anti-consumer "remedies" that should not be given any weight whatsoever.

John Hightower  
Little Rock, Arkansas end-user